

### III. REMARKS

1. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 9-13 are new. Claims 1-13 are pending in this Application. No new matter has been added.

2. Claims 1-8 are not anticipated by Wright et al. (4,802,218) ("Wright") as evidenced by Aldebert et al. (5,794,033) ("Aldebert") and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites in pertinent part that the cryptographic encoding of the indicium [is] locally modifiable by a user of the secure postage metering device. Neither Wright nor Aldebert disclose or suggest locally modifying the cryptographic encoding of a postage indicium by a user of a secure postage meter.

Wright discloses an automated franking transaction system employing cards (10, 90, 100) for maintaining an account balance, providing postal rates for a particular carrier and providing the services of a particular carrier (col. 16, l. 60 - col. 17, l. 14; col. 12, l. 3-9 and col. 14, l. 21-45). Wright also discloses a terminal (20) for dispensing an article of value and debiting the card's balance. In Wright, coded marks are printed within the visible postmark and the algorithm for the coded marks is selected by the issuer, such as the United States Postal Service (col. 12, l. 56-67; also a distinction is made between a "user" of the system versus an "issuer" of the system in Wright, for example, at col. 8, l. 66 - col. 9, l. 24).

In Wright, only the issuer has the authority to set the encryption algorithm of the coded mark in the postage indicium

(col. 12, l. 56-67). This is not what is claimed in Applicant's claim 1. Claim 1 calls for the cryptographic encoding of the indicium being locally modifiable by a user of the secure postage metering device. There is simply no disclosure or suggestion of a user locally modifying the encryption algorithm in Wright. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Wright.

Aldebert fails to remedy the deficiencies of Wright. Aldebert does not disclose or suggest a postage meter nonetheless the modification of the encryption of a postage indicium by a user of the meter as called for in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Wright as evidenced by Aldebert.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and should also be allowable at least because of their respective dependencies.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.



The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Geza C. Ziegler Sr."

Reg. No. 44,004

Perman & Green, LLP  
425 Post Road  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 259-1800  
Customer No.: 2512

31 August 2005

Date

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: Aug. 31, 2005

Signature: Meagan Bayard  
Person Making Deposit